



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,066	01/24/2005	Stanley George Bonney	PG4884USw	7458
23347	7590	11/29/2007		
GLAXOSMITHKLINE CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, MAI B475 FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398			EXAMINER PATEL, NIHIR B	
			ART UNIT 3772	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USCIPRTP@GSK.COM
ROSALIE.M.CHAMBERLAIN@GSK.COM
JULIE.D.MCFALLS@GSK.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/523,066

Applicant(s)

BONNEY ET AL.

Examiner

Nihir Patel

Art Unit

3772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11.05.2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on **November 5th, 2007** has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1-13 and 15-23** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1-4, 12-14, 17 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Riccio (US 3,923,202).

5. **As to claims 1, 17 and 18**, Riccio teaches an apparatus that comprises a first medicament container **18** containing the first medicament (**see figure 1**); at least one further medicament dispenser **32** containing the at least one further medicament (**see figure 1**); a mixing chamber **17** (**see figure 1**) comprising inlets for receiving medicament from each medicament dispenser and

an outlet for delivery of the combination medicament dispenser (**see column 5 lines 1-10**); wherein said first medicament dispenser and said at least one further medicament dispenser enable the first and the at least one further medicament to be kept separate until the point of device, and the first medicament dispenser is different in type to the at least one further medicament dispenser (**see column 4 lines 55-68 and column 5 lines 1-10**).

6. **As to claim 2**, Riccio teaches an apparatus wherein the device comprises the first medicament dispenser and only one further medicament dispenser (**see figure 1**).

7. **As to claim 3**, Riccio teaches an apparatus wherein the first medicament dispenser is selected from the group consisting of a reservoir dry powder inhaler (RDPI), a multi-dose dry powder inhaler (MDPI), a unit dose dry powder inhaler (UDPI), a metered dose inhaler (MDI) and a liquid spray inhaler (LSI) and the at least one further medicament dispenser is selected from the group consisting of a reservoir dry powder inhaler (RDPI), a multi-dose dry powder inhaler (MDPI), a unit dose dry powder inhaler (UDPI), a metered dose inhaler (MDI) and a liquid spray inhaler (LSI) (**see column 4 lines 55-68**).

8. **As to claim 4**, Riccio teaches an apparatus wherein the first medicament dispenser is a reservoir dry powder inhaler (RDPI), and the at least one further medicament dispenser is of a type selected from the group consisting of a multi-dose dry powder inhaler (MDPI), a metered dose inhaler (MDI) and a liquid spray inhaler (LSI) (**see column 4 lines 55-68**).

9. **As to claim 12**, Riccio teaches an apparatus wherein the metered dose inhaler (MDI) is arranged to reversibly receive a liquid container suitable for containing medicament in liquid form (**see column 4 lines 55-68**).

10. As to **claim 13**, Riccio teaches an apparatus that comprises a coupled actuator for the first medicament dispenser and the at least one further medicament dispenser (**see figure 1**).

11. As to **claim 14**, Riccio teaches an apparatus wherein said outlet communicates with a common mouthpiece **14** (**see figure 1**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

14. Claim **23** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riccio (US 3,923,202).

15. As to **claim 23**, Riccio substantially discloses a method step of providing a patient in need thereof a medicament dispenser device and dispensing a combination medicament product from said device (**see column 4 lines 55-68 and column 5 lines 1-10**).

16. Claims **5-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riccio (US 3,923,202) in view of Marand (US 3,704,725).

Riccio does not teach a unitary medicament dispenser device for use in the delivery of a first medicament and at least one further medicament as a combination medicament product.

However, Marand teaches a unitary medicament dispenser (**Figure 1**), product container (**first medicament dispenser**), (1) and a propellant: cartridge (**at least one further medicament dispenser**) (9), that dispenses a combination medicament product by means of coupler-aspirator (3). Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the device of Riccio to allow the dispensing of a combination medicament product, as taught by Marand, as such a modification would allow a user or patient to inhale a specialized medicament for an appropriate treatment that results from two separate initial medicaments.

17. Claims **19-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riccio (US 3,923,202) in view of Makiej, Jr. (US 5,002,048).

18. As to claims **19-22**, Riccio substantially discloses the claimed invention, see rejection of claim 1 above, but does not disclose a first medicament that comprises a bronchodilator (beta-agonist) and the at least one further medicament comprises an anti-inflammatory (steroid).

Makiej teaches an apparatus that does provide a first medicament that comprises a bronchodilator (beta-agonist) and the at least one further medicament comprises an anti-inflammatory (steroid) (**see column 3 lines 1-15**). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Riccio's invention by providing a first medicament that comprises a bronchodilator (beta-agonist) and the at least

one further medicament comprises an anti-inflammatory (steroid) as taught by Makiej in order to make it easier to breathe.

19. Claim **16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riccio (US 3,923,202) in view of Anderson et al. (US 6,958,691).

20. **As to claim 16**, Riccio substantially discloses the claimed invention, see rejection of claim 1 above, but does not disclose a breath sensor for sensing the breath of a patient wherein actuation of the first medicament dispenser and/or the at least one further medicament dispenser is responsive to said breath sensor. Anderson teaches an apparatus that comprises a breath sensor for sensing the breath of a patient wherein actuation of the first medicament dispenser and/or the at least one further medicament dispenser is responsive to said breath sensor (**see column 11 lines 5-15**). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Riccio's invention by providing a breath sensor for sensing the breath of a patient wherein actuation of the first medicament dispenser and/or the at least one further medicament dispenser is responsive to said breath sensor as taught by Anderson in order to prevent waste of medicament.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nihir Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4803. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 to 4:30 every other Fridays off.

Application/Control Number:
10/523,066
Art Unit: 3772

Page 7

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Bianco can be reached on (571) 272-4940. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit 3772



Nihir Patel



PATRICIA BIANCO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

11/20/07